



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/578,751	05/25/2000	Theodore Jack London Shrader	AUS000168US1	6562

7590 07/29/2003

DUKE W. YEE
CARSTENS YEE & CAHOON LLP
P O BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

FISCHER, ANDREW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/578,751

Applicant(s)

SHRADER ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew J. Fischer

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 . 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicants' election with traverse of Invention I (claims 1-14) in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that inventions are not distinct. Applicants admit that "If the examiner were hypothetically able to find prior art that rendered the invention cover by claim 1 as unpatentable, this same prior art would also render claim 15 unpatentable because claim 15 is directed towards a computer program product that causes steps to be executed in which those steps are identical to the steps set forth in method claim 1."¹

2. It is the Examiner's position that Applicants are arguing that the groups are not patentably distinct. Although Applicants argued "distinct" and not 'patentably distinct,' the Examiner finds that, in this particular case these two phrases as used in this application and prosecution history, are synonymous.

After further review of Applicants' specification and claims, the prior art, and Applicants' arguments in Paper No. 8, the Examiner finds that the groups of Inventions are not patentably distinct. While the Examiner has considered all evidence of record, the Examiner finds that Applicants' statements on this matter to be strong evidence that the groups are not patentably distinct. Therefore, the Restriction (Paper No. 7) is hereby withdrawn.

3. Applicants have now amended claim 1. However, after further review of Applicants' specification and claims, the prior art, and Applicants' arguments in Paper No. 8, the Examiner

¹ See Applicants' Response, "Remarks", Page 5.

Art Unit: 3627

also finds that Invention in Group Ia (amended claims 1-9) are not patentably distinct from Invention Group IB (claims 10-14). Therefore, a restriction at this time is improper. Applicants' confirmation of this position (that Group IA is not patentably distinct from Group IB) in their next reply is respectfully requested.

4. Should Applicants argue in response to this Office Action *or in any future office action* that one group of claims is not patentably distinct from another group of claims, a restriction and/or election of species will follow. Upon amendment of any claim in this application, Applicants are respectfully requested to re-confirm their position that the groups of inventions are not patentably distinct. Failure by Applicant to reconfirm this position may result in a restriction or election of species by the Examiner.

Drawings

5. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on November 20, 2000 (Paper No. 6) have been approved by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 3627

7. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

a. Claim 15 is directed to neither a “process” nor a “machine,” but rather embraces or overlaps two different statutory classes of invention. See MPEP §2173.05(p) II or *Ex Parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (B.P.A.I., 1990).

The Examiner respectfully requests Applicants to expressly state whether they intend to claim a product claim or a process claim. On one hand, it appears Applicants are claiming a medium (a product claim placing it within the §101 category of a machine since the preamble of claim 15 states “A computer program product”)² and yet are still attempting to claim a method or process claim (“the following method steps: . . .”).

b. Claims 16 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not within the technological arts. The claim does not recite computer structure which would place them with the technological arts. See *In re Toma*, 575 F.2d 872, 197 USPQ 852, (CCPA 1978).

Because Applicants have claimed a “medium,” the Examiner finds that claim 16 is directed towards a product and *not* a process. Because Applicants’ have claimed a product with “code for” doing particular tasks, that have not actually claimed that the tasks are performed.

² “When a computer program is recited in conjunction with a physical structure, such as a computer memory, Office personnel should treat the claim as a product claim.” MPEP §2106 IV B. 1 (a) (last paragraph).

Art Unit: 3627

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Claim 15 is directed to neither a “process” nor a “machine,” but rather embraces or overlaps two different statutory classes of invention. It is therefore unclear whether Applicant(s) are claiming a process or a machine. See MPEP §2173.05(p) II or *Ex Parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (B.P.A.I. 1990) and the §101 rejection above.

b. In claim 16, the scope is unclear since it is not directed towards patentable subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. . . .
- (e) the invention was described in-

Art Unit: 3627

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

11. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

‘StreetPrices.com’ website printout of January 25, 1999 (“Streetprices 1/99”). Streetprices 1/99 discloses generating a set of product profiles (see e.g. ‘Computers’, ‘Flowers’ and “Toys”), each identifying a given site URL (inherent); a list of one or more included items to be queried (inherent), a scan interval (inherent in the graphs) and a site template (inherent in the search engine); periodically retrieving data from the given site URL (inherent in the x axis of the graph) according to the scan interval; parsing the data retrieved to generate a data record (inherent since it discloses the price over time); storing the data records (inherent); and the product profiles includes one or more triggers (a threshold price which sends an email when a price drops below a particular level).

12. Claims 15 and 16 are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based upon a public use or sale of the invention. In this case, evidence to support the public use is the StreetPrices.com website. See the additional cited StreetPrices.com printouts noted below and the Streetprices 1/99 noted above.

Art Unit: 3627

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 15 and 16 are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Streetprices 1/99.³ It is the Examiner's principle position that claims 15 and 16 are anticipated because of the inherencies noted above. However, if not inherent, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Streetprices 1/99 to include a URL, a list of excluded items, a scan interval and scan date. While including the URL would have made the searching more efficient, including a scan interval would have tailored the program to include items with different price volatilities. For example, real estate prices generally do not change hourly while airline tickets and consumer products may.

15. Claims 1-14 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Streetprices 1/99. These claims represent different groups of inventions. Applicants have admitted in their latest response (Paper No. 8, Page 5) that the patentability of these groups (and claims) is dependent upon the rejection of claims 1-14. The Examiner relies on this admission.

³ See MPEP §2112 expressly authorizing alternative §102/§103 rejections when the question of inherency is present in the anticipation rejection.

Art Unit: 3627

16. Functional recitations using the word “for” (e.g. “for collecting product data” as recited in claim 15) have been given less patentable weight⁴ because they fail to add any steps and are thereby regarded as intended use language. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in additional steps. See *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Laboratories, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1368, 1375-76, 58 USPQ2d 1508, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (Where the language in a method claim states only a purpose and intended result, the expression does not result in a manipulative difference in the steps of the claim.).

17. After careful review of the specification and prosecution history, the Examiner is unaware of any desire—either expressly or implicitly—by Applicants to be their own lexicographer and to define a claim term to have a meaning other than its ordinary and accustom meaning. Therefore, the Examiner starts with the heavy presumption that all claim limitations are given their ordinary and accustom meaning. See *Bell Atlantic Network Services Inc. v. Covad Communications Group Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1258, 1268, 59 USPQ2d 1865, 1870 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (“[T]here is a heavy presumption in favor of the ordinary meaning of claim language as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.”); *CCS Fitness Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.*, 288 F.3d 1359, 1366, 62 USPQ2d 1658, 1662 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (There is a “heavy presumption that a claim term carries its ordinary and

⁴ See e.g. *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)(stating that although all limitations must be considered, not all limitations are entitled to patentable weight.).

Art Unit: 3627

customary meaning.”). See also MPEP §2111.01 and *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989).⁵

In accordance with the ordinary and accustom meaning presumption, during examination the claims are interpreted with their “broadest reasonable interpretation” *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997).⁶

However, if Applicants disagree with the Examiner and have either (a) already used lexicography or (b) wish to use lexicography and therefore (under either (a) or (b)) desire a claim limitation to have a meaning other than its ordinary and accustom meaning, the Examiner respectfully requests Applicants in their next response to expressly indicate⁷ the claim limitation at issue and to show where in the specification or prosecution history the limitation is defined. Such definitions must be clearly stated in the specification or file history. *Bell Atlantic*, 262 F.3d at 1268, 59 USPQ2d at 1870, (“[I]n redefining the meaning of particular claim terms away from the

⁵ It is the Examiner’s position that “plain meaning” and “ordinary and accustom meaning” are synonymous. See e.g. *Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.*, 274 F.3d 1336, 1342, 60 USPQ2d 1851, 1854 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (“[A]ll terms in a patent claim are to be given their plain, ordinary and accustomed meaning . . .”).

⁶ See also MPEP §2111.

⁷ “Absent an *express intent* to impart a novel meaning, terms in a claim are to be given their ordinary and accustomed meaning. [Emphasis added.]” *Wenger Manufacturing Inc. v. Coating Mach. Sys., Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1225, 1232, 57 USPQ2d 1679, 1684 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (citations and quotations omitted). “In the absence of an *express intent* to impart a novel meaning to claim terms, an inventor’s claim terms take on their ordinary meaning. We indulge a heavy presumption that a claim term carries its ordinary and customary meaning. [Emphasis added.]” *Teleflex Inc. v. Ficosa North America Corp.*, 299 F.3d 1313, 1325, 63 USPQ2d 1374, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citations and quotations omitted).

Art Unit: 3627

ordinary meaning, the intrinsic evidence must 'clearly set forth' or 'clearly redefine' a claim term so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the patentee intended to so redefine the claim term").⁸ The Examiner cautions that no new matter is allowed.

Failure by Applicants in their next response to properly traverse this issue in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) or to be non-responsive to this issue entirely will be considered a desire by Applicants to forgo lexicography in this application and to continue having the claims interpreted with their ordinary and accustomed meaning and with their broadest reasonable interpretation.⁹ Additionally, it is the Examiner's position that above requirements are

⁸ See also *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582, 39 USPQ2d 1573, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996), ("[A] patentee may choose to be his own lexicographer and use terms in a manner other than their ordinary meaning, *as long as* the special definition of the term is *clearly stated* in the patent specification or file history. [Emphasis added.]"); *Multiform Desiccants Inc. v. Medzam Ltd.*, 133 F.3d 1473, 1477, 45 USPQ2d 1429, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1998) ("Such special meaning, however, must be sufficiently clear in the specification that any departure from common usage would be so understood by a person of experience in the field of the invention."). See also MPEP §2111.01, subsection titled "Applicant May Be Own Lexicographer" and MPEP §2173.05(a) titled "New Terminology."

⁹ See 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(3) which states in part: "the examiner may rely upon admissions by applicant . . . as to *any matter* affecting patentability [Emphasis added.]"

Art Unit: 3627

reasonable.¹⁰ Unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner, the preceding discussion on claim interpretation principles applies to all examined claims currently pending.

18. Under the broadest reasonable interpretation standard noted above and in accordance with *In re Morris*, the Examiner hereby adopts the following definitions in all his claim interpretations:

a. **Server:** “2. On the Internet or other network, a computer or program that responds to commands from a client.” Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition, Microsoft Press, Redmond, WA, 1997.¹¹ **Client:** “3. On a local area network or Internet, a computer that accesses shared network resources provided by another computer (called a *server*).” *Id.* **Computer:** “Any machine that does three things: accepts structured input, processes it according to prescribed rules, and produces the results as output.” *Id.*

b. **Data** “Plural of the Latin *datum*, meaning an item of information. In practice, data is often used for the singular as well as plural the form of the noun.” *Id.*

¹⁰ The Examiner’s requirements on this matter are reasonable on at least two separate and independent grounds. First, the Examiner’s requirements are simply an express request for clarification of how Applicants intend their claims to be interpreted so that lexicography (or even an *attempt* at lexicography) by Applicants is not inadvertently overlooked by the Examiner. Second, the requirements are reasonable in view of the USPTO’s goals of compact prosecution, productivity with particular emphasis on reductions in both pendency and cycle time, and other goals as outlined in the USPTO’s The 21st Century Strategic Plan, February 3, 2003 available at www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/strat21/index.htm (last accessed July 1, 2003).

¹¹ The Examiner finds that the *Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary* is an appropriate technical dictionary known to be used by one of ordinary skill in this art. See e.g. *Altiris Inc. v. Symantec Corp.*, 318 F.3d 1363, 1373, 65 USPQ2d 1865, 1872 (Fed. Cir. 2003) where the Federal Circuit used *Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary* (Third Edition) as “a technical dictionary” used to define the term “flag.”

Art Unit: 3627

19. It is the Examiner's factual determination that all limitations in claims 1-16 have been considered and are either disclosed or inherent in the references as discussed above. Furthermore, the inherent features are established by a preponderance of the evidence. *In re Epstein*, 32 F.3d 1559, 1564, 31 USPQ2d 1817, 1820 (Fed. Cir. 1994) ("Preponderance of the evidence is the standard that must be met by the PTO in making rejections." (citations and quotations omitted)). The preceding discussion in this paragraph regarding the standard for claim rejections applies to all examined claims currently pending.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicants' disclosure includes the following: Delurgio et. al. (U.S. 6,553,552 B2); Ng (U.S. 6,405,175 B1); DeMarcken (U.S. 6,275,808 B1); Website printout from www.Streetprices.com, ("Streetprices 5/00"); Website printout from www.Streetprices.com titled 'Timeline', ("Streetprices Timeline 7/03"); Website printout from www.Streetprices.com, ("Streetprices 12/98"); Website printout from www.Streetprices.com titled 'Timeline', ("Streetprices Timeline 5/00"); Press Release from www.Dealtime.com titled "DealTime Unveils DealAgent TM 2.0 Dynamic Pricing Engine"; Press Release from www.pricegrabber.com titled "Summer's First Box-Office Smash: Pricegrabber.com Finds the Best Price on Movies"; Press Release from www.pricegrabber.com titled "ConsumerREVIEW.com Teams with Pricegrabber.com to Bring Shoppers Unbiased Computing and Consumer Electronics Product Review"; Press Release from www.pricegrabber.com titled

Art Unit: 3627

“Pricegrabber.com Introduces MyPricegrabber The ‘Personal Shopper’ for the cybershopper”; Press Release from www.pricegrabber.com titled “Pricegrabber and Pcorder Team up for Superior E-shopping Experience”; Press Release from www.pricegrabber.com titled “Pricegrabber Alert offered to Lycos e-Mail Subscribers”; and Press Release from www.pricegrabber.com titled “Pricegrabber.com Makes Bottom-Line Costs Clear for Shoppers”.

21. Unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner, the following two citations to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (“MPEP”) apply to this Office Action: MPEP citations to Chapters 200, 700, 1800, and 2100 are from the MPEP 8th Edition, Rev 1, February 2003. All remaining MPEP citations within this Office Action are from MPEP 8th Edition, August 2001.

22. Suggestions or examples of claim language provided by the Examiner in this Office Action are just that—suggestions or examples—and do not constitute a formal requirement mandated by the Examiner. Unless stated otherwise by an express indication that the claim is “allowed,” exemplary claim language provided by the Examiner to overcome a particular rejection or to change claim interpretation has *not been addressed* with respect to other aspects of patentability (e.g. §101 patentable subject matter, §112 1st paragraph written description and enablement, §112 2nd paragraph antecedent basis and indefiniteness, and §102 and §103 prior art). Therefore, any claim amendment that incorporates an Examiner suggestion or example or simply changes claim interpretation will still require further consideration and/or search and a patentability determination as noted above.

Art Unit: 3627

23. In accordance with *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1344, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1434-35 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the Examiner finds that the references How Computers Work Millennium Ed. by Ron White; How Networks Work, Millennium Ed. by Frank J. Derfler et. al.; and How the Internet Works, Millennium Ed. by Preston Gralla are additional evidence of what is basic knowledge or common sense to one of ordinary skill in this art. Each reference is cited in its entirety. Moreover, because the references are directed towards beginners (see “User Level: Beginning . . .”), the Examiner finds that the references are primarily directed towards those of *low* skill in this art. Because the references are directed towards those of low skill in this art, the Examiner finds that one of *ordinary* skill in this art must—at the very least—be aware of and/or understand the knowledge and information contained within the references.

24. Furthermore, all factual findings and conclusions of law in this Office Action are based the entire record. Although the Examiner may have singled out various items of evidence (e.g. prior art) and expressly noted their content, this does *not* mean that the other documents of record were not considered and applied when making the prior art rejections above. Moreover, because the cannons of claim construction are generally viewed from a person of ordinary skill in the art,¹² the other documents of record not specifically mentioned in the prior art rejections above were used in the Examiner’s deliberative process to assess, inter alia, the definiteness of the claims, the level of skill in the art, and ultimately the patentability of the claimed invention.

¹² See e.g. *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 806 F.2d 1565, 1576, 1 USPQ2d 1081, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 1986)(noting that the definiteness inquiry focuses on whether those skilled in the art would understand the scope of the claim).

Art Unit: 3627

25. In accordance with the USPTO's goals of customer service, compact prosecution, and reduction of cycle time, the Examiner has made every effort to clarify his position regarding claim interpretation and any rejections or objections in this application. Furthermore, the Examiner has provided Applicants with notice—for due process purposes—of his position regarding his factual determinations and legal conclusions. If Applicants disagree with *any* factual determination or legal conclusion made by the Examiner in this Office Action whether expressly stated or implied,¹³ the Examiner respectfully reminds Applicants to properly traverse the Examiner's position(s) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) *in their next response*. By addressing these issues now, matters where the Examiner and Applicants agree can be eliminated allowing the Examiner and Applicants to focus on areas of disagreement (if any) with the goal towards allowance in the shortest possible time. If Applicants have any questions regarding the Examiner's positions or have other questions regarding this communication or even previous communications, Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact Examiner Andrew J. Fischer whose telephone number is (703) 305-0292.


Andrew J. Fischer
Patent Examiner

AJF
July 21, 2003

¹³ E.g., if the Examiner rejected a claim under §103 with two references, although not directly stated, it is the Examiner's implied position that the references are analogous art.